



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,450	02/23/2004	Martin Zilliacus	P4257US00	8280
11764	7590	02/02/2011		
Ditthavong Mori & Steiner, P.C. 918 Prince Street Alexandria, VA 22314				
EXAMINER				
JAKOVAC, RYAN J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2445				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/02/2011		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/784,450

Applicant(s)

ZILLIACUS ET AL.

Examiner

RYAN J. JAKOVAC

Art Unit

2445

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,8-10,18,22,26,27,29,32,34,36,38,43-45,48 and 52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,8-10,18,22,26,27,29,32,34,36,38,43-45,48 and 52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of Falsely Cited (PTO-532)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/10/2010, 1/28/2011
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to communications filed 12/16/2010. Claims 1, 2, 8-10, 18, 22, 26, 27, 29, 32, 34, 36, 38, 43-45, 48 and 52 are currently pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed 12/16/2010 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statements filed 12/10/2010 and 01/28/2011 have been received and considered by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 12/16/2010 have been fully considered

5. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. Applicant's arguments are persuasive and therefore the claim rejections under 35 USC § 112 are withdrawn.

7. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. Applicant argues in summary that the cited references do not disclose:

a) directing dispatch of the message to the one or more determined recipients by assigning recipient Radio Frequency (RF) identifiers, associated with a radio frequency tag or a radio frequency tag reader associated with a recipient of the message, to the message, and dispatching the message when the radio frequency tag or radio frequency tag reader is placed in proximity to the network hub

b) wherein the display is associated with the radio frequency (RF) identifier

9. Regarding a), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Domnitz discloses these limitations in at least col. 4:56-67, col. 5:5-11, the abstract, col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3, and figs. 1-2. For example, Domnitz discloses that users are assigned RFID tags (Domnitz, col. 5:33-57.). Messages such as emails (Domnitz, col. 5:7-11) are dispatched to the recipient based on proximity (Domnitz, col. 5:11-20, abstract, col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3.).

10. Regarding b), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The display's as disclosed by Domnitz include the display's of phones, PDAs, CPU, laptops, etc (see Domnitz, fig. 1-2, col. 4:45-51, abstract.). The user (i.e. operating for instance a PDA, phone, CPU, etc) is dispatched an email based on his RFID information and the email is displayed on the user's device. Therefore, the display is clearly associated with the RFID since the messages is dispatched to the device (i.e. the display on the device) using the RFID information. Moreover, Domnitz discloses that the RFID information may be integrated with the PDA, PC, or wireless telephone (Domnitz, col. 8:10-20.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 18-19, 22, 25-27, 36, 38-39, 43-44, 48-49, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft Outlook 97 (hereinafter Outlook) in view of US 6944272 to Thomas, in view of US 2005/0114453 to Hardt, and further in view of US 6912398 to Domnitz

Regarding claim 1, 22, 25, 36, Outlook teaches a method comprising:

directing receipt of a generic-recipient message by a network hub, wherein the generic-recipient message comprises a message sent to a group or community address (Outlook, pg. 86, 157-159, message sending using personal distribution list.);

determining predefined attributes of the message, wherein the predefined attributes comprise one or more of a sender of the message, subject of the message, or content of the message (Outlook, pg. 86, 157-159, sender of the message is determined as messages are routed through the server.);

directing dispatch of the message to the one or more determined recipients (Outlook, pg. 157-159, email distributed based on distribution group membership.)

Outlook does not expressly disclose but Thomas discloses determining a type of communication medium of the message (Thomas, col. 7:50-67, "The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner." See also fig. 3. See also col. 4:54-56, messages include fields indicating they type of communication medium of the message.),

determining one or more recipients for the message based at least in part upon the determined type (Thomas, col. 9 table 2, messages are selected based on type (e.g. fax, email, voice Col. 9:36-40, selected messages are forwarded to other subscribers.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Thomas and Outlook in order to administer messages (Thomas, col. 7:58-62).

Outlook and Thomas does not expressly disclose, but Hardt discloses: determining one or more recipients for the message further based at least in part upon the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with stored information related to potential recipients (Hardt, [0022], [0068], the message is routed to recipients based on analysis of the title or body of the message. Rule based processing is used in accordance with recipient addresses and user account information.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Hardt with the teachings of Outlook and Thomas in order to route

messages based on attributes of the message such as the title or the body to specific recipients with a specialization in a particular area (Hardt, [0068]).

Outlook, Thomas, and Hardt do not expressly disclose, but Domnitz discloses directing dispatch of the message to the one or more determined recipients by assigning recipient Radio Frequency (RF) identifiers, associated with a radio frequency tag or a radio frequency tag reader associated with a recipient of the message, to the message (Domnitz, col. 4:56-67, col. 5:5-11, the abstract, col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3, and figs. 1-2.), and dispatching the message when the radio frequency tag or radio frequency tag reader is placed in proximity to the network hub (Domnitz, col. 5:7-11, email is dispatched to a person's PDA based upon RFID location. See col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3. See col. 4:56-67, col. 5:5-11, the abstract, col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3, and figs. 1-2.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Outlook, Thomas, Hardt, and Domnitz in order to dispatch messages based on a person's location (Domnitz, col. 3:24-37.).

Regarding claim 2, 9, 18, 26, 38, 44, 48, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Hardt, and Domnitz teaches the method of claim 1, where receiving receipt of a generic-recipient message by a network hub further comprises directing receipt of a generic-recipient message, chosen from the group of messages consisting of an electronic mail (email) message and voice message (Outlook, pg. 55, email, recipients of group distribution message. Pg. 97, recipient is alerted to the presence of an email message as well as the importance associated with the message.).

wherein determining a type communication medium of the message comprises determining whether the message comprises an, electronic mail (email) message, or voice

message (Thomas, col. 7:50-67, “The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner.” See also fig. 3. See also col. 4:54-56, messages include fields indicating they type of communication medium of the message.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Outlook, Thomas, Hardt, and Domnitz in order to administer messages (Thomas, col. 7:58-62).

Thomas does not expressly disclose choosing or determining from Short Message Service (SMS) message or a Multimedia Message Service (MMS) message, however, these limitations are mere variations of the common formats chosen/determined by Thomas and as such would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine with Outlook, Thomas, and Hardt.

Regarding claim 7, 27, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Hardt, and Domnitz teaches the method of claim 1 and network hub device of claim 22, wherein directing dispatch of the message to one or more recipients further comprises directing display of the message on a display (Domnitz, fig. 1-2, col. 4:45-51, abstract, col. 8:10-20.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Outlook, Thomas, Hardt, and Domnitz in order to dispatch messages based on a person's location (Domnitz, col. 3:24-37.).

Regarding claim 8, the combination of Outlook, Hardt, Thomas, and Domnitz teaches the method of claim 7 wherein directing display of the message on a display further comprises directing display of the message on a display associated with a radio frequency (RF) identifier (Domnitz, col. 5:7:-11, 30-50, fig. 1-2, displays associated with radio frequency identifiers, laptop, pda.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine wherein the step of displaying the message on a display further comprises displaying the message on a display associated with a radio frequency (RF) identifier as taught by Domnitz with Outlook, Thomas, and Hardt to provide information to individuals based on their time and location (Domnitz, abstract, 5:30-50.).

Regarding claim 43 the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Hardt, and Domnitz teaches the computer program product of claim 42 wherein the instructions configured for directing display of the message on a display associated with the network hub further comprises fourth instructions configured for directing display of the message, which is associated with a Radio Frequency (RF) identifier, on a display associated with the network hub (Domnitz, fig. 1, email, PDA, pc, or cell phone display messages associated with a radio frequency identifier.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Outlook, Hardt, Thomas, and Domnitz in order to provide information to individuals based on their time and location (Domnitz, abstract, 5:30-50.).

Regarding claim 3, 19, 39, 49, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Hardt, and Domnitz teaches the method of claim 10, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Hardt, and Domnitz does not expressly disclose wherein directing receipt of a generic-recipient message at a network hub further comprises directing receipt of a message by a wireless network hub.

However, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to combine receiving a generic-recipient message at a wireless network hub with the teachings of Outlook, Thomas, Hardt, and Domnitz since incorporating wireless technology amounts to applying a known technique to a known device ready for improvement to yield predictable results (e.g. wireless transmission of messages). See MPEP 2141.

Regarding claim 52, the combination of Outlook, Hardt, Thomas, and Domnitz teaches the method of Claim 10, further comprising displaying of the message on a display responsive to the radio frequency tag or radio frequency tag reader being placed in proximity to the network hub (Domnitz, col. 5:7-11, email is dispatched to a person's PDA based upon RFID location. See col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3. See col. 4:56-67, col. 5:5-11, the abstract, col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3, and figs. 1-2.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Outlook, Thomas, Hardt, and Domnitz in order to dispatch messages based on a person's location (Domnitz, col. 3:24-37.).

13. Claims 10-17, 23-24, 29-34, 42, 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Outlook in view of Thomas, in view of US 2005/0149622 to Kirkland et al (hereinafter Kirkland), and further in view of Domnitz.

Regarding claim, 10, 29, 45, Outlook teaches a method for prioritizing a generic recipient message at a network hub, the method comprising:

directing receipt of a generic-recipient message by a network hub, wherein the generic-recipient message is comprises a message sent to a group or community address (Outlook, pg. 86, 157-159, message sending using personal distribution list.);

determining predefined attributes of the message, wherein the predefined attributes comprise one or more of a sender of the message, subject of the message, or content of the message (Outlook, pg. 86, 157-159, sender of the message is determined as messages are routed through the server.);

Outlook does not expressly disclose, but Thomas discloses determining a type of communication medium of the message (Thomas, col. 7:50-67, "The message type field 304 is used to indicate how the original message was sent, whether by fax, email, voicemail, page, or by some other manner." See also fig. 3. See also col. 4:54-56, messages include fields indicating they type of communication medium of the message.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Thomas and Outlook in order to administer messages (Thomas, col. 7:58-62).

Outlook and Thomas do not expressly disclose determining whether the message has priority based at least in part on the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with pre- stored priority information; and prioritizing the message when a determination is made that the message has priority.

However, Kirkland discloses determining whether the message has priority based at least in part on the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with pre- stored priority information; and prioritizing the message when a determination is made that the message has priority (Kirkland, abstract, priority level of a message is determined according to the subject of the message and the messages is delivered and displayed to the recipient according to the priority level.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine determining whether the message has priority based at least in part on the predefined attributes by comparing the predefined attributes of the message with pre- stored priority information; and prioritizing the message if a determination is made that the message has priority as taught by Kirkland with the method of Outlook and Thomas in order to determine message priority based on the subject of the message (Kirkland, abstract, fig. 7.).

Outlook, Thomas, and Kirkland do not expressly disclose determining to dispatch the prioritized message when a recipient-assigned Radio Frequency (RF) identifier associated with a radio frequency tag or a radio frequency tag reader associated with a recipient of the message is placed in proximity to the network hub.

However, Domnitz discloses determining to dispatch the prioritized message when a recipient-assigned Radio Frequency (RF) identifier associated with a radio frequency tag

or a radio frequency tag reader associated with a recipient of the message is placed in proximity to the network hub (Domnitz, col. 5:7-11, email is dispatched to a person's PDA based upon RFID location. See col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3. See col. 4:56-67, col. 5:5-11, the abstract, col. 7:57-67 to col. 8:3, and figs. 1-2.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz in order to dispatch messages based on a person's location (Domnitz, col. 3:24-37.).

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz teaches the method of claim 10, wherein the step of determining whether the message has priority based on the predefined attributes further comprises determining whether the message has display priority based on the predefined attributes (Kirkland, abstract. See also, fig. 8.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Kirkland with Outlook and Thomas in order to determine message priority based on the subject of the message (Kirkland, abstract, fig. 7.).

Regarding claim 12, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz teaches the method of Claim 11, wherein prioritizing the message when a determination is made that the message has priority further comprises prioritizing the display of the message when a determination is made that the message has display priority (Kirkland, abstract. See also, fig. 8.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Kirkland with Outlook and Thomas in order to determine message priority based on the subject of the message (Kirkland, abstract, fig. 7.).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz teaches the method of Claim 12, wherein prioritizing the display of the message when a determination is made that the message has display priority further comprises directing display of displaying the message in a prominent position on a display associated with the hub (Kirkland, abstract. See also, fig. 8.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Kirkland with Outlook and Thomas in order to deliver and display messages according to priority (Kirkland, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding claim 14, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz d teaches the method of Claim 10, wherein determining whether the message has priority based on the predefined attributes further comprises determining whether the message has dispatch priority based on the predefined attributes (Kirkland, abstract. See also, fig. 8. See also Outlook pg. 97.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Kirkland with Outlook and Thomas in order to determine message priority base on subject or content (Kirkland, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding claim 15, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz teaches the method of Claim 13, wherein prioritizing the message when a determination is made that the message has priority further comprises prioritizing the dispatch of the message when a determination is made that the message has dispatch priority (Kirkland, abstract. See also, fig. 8. See also Outlook pg. 97.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Kirkland with Outlook and Thomas in order to determine message priority base on subject or content (Kirkland, abstract, fig. 7, [0009]).

Regarding claim 16, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz teaches the method of Claim 15, wherein prioritizing the dispatch of the message when a determination is made that the message has dispatch priority further comprises prioritizing the communication medium used to dispatch the message when a determination is made that the message has communication medium dispatch priority (Kirkland, abstract. See also, fig. 8. See also Outlook pg. 97.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz in order to determine message priority base on subject or content (Kirkland, abstract, fig. 7, [0009]).

Regarding claim 17, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz teaches the method of claim 15, wherein the step of prioritizing the dispatch of the message if a determination is made that the message has dispatch priority further comprises the step of

prioritizing the time of dispatch of the message if a determination is made that the message has time dispatch priority (Outlook, pg. 97, 100, timed delivery options.).

Regarding claim 23, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz teaches the apparatus of claim 22. Domnitz teaches wherein the at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured to, with the at least one processor, cause the apparatus to direct dispatch of the message by directing dispatch of the message to one or more determined recipients via lower power RF (Domnitz, fig. 1.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz in order to provide information to individuals based on their time and location (Domnitz, abstract, 5:30-50.).

Regarding claim 24, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz teaches claim 22, wherein the at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured to, with the at least one processor cause the apparatus to direct dispatch of the message directing dispatch of the message to one or more determined recipients by directing dispatch of the message to one or more determined recipients via a digital cellular network (Domnitz, fig. 3. See also col. 7:30-46.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz in order to provide information to individuals based on their time and location (Domnitz, abstract, 5:30-50.).

Regarding claim 30, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz teaches the apparatus of Claim 29, wherein the processor is further configured to at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured to, with the at least one processor, further cause the apparatus to determine predefined attributes of the received generic-recipient message and compare the predefined attributes to pre-stored display priority information to determine if the received message requires display prioritization (Kirkland, abstract, fig. 8.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz in order to determine message priority base on subject or content (Kirkland, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding claim 31, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz teaches the apparatus of Claim 30, further comprising a display associated with the apparatus that is configured to, under the direction of the at least one memory and stored computer program code, display message identifiers to one or more recipients (Kirkland, abstract. See also, fig. 8. See also Outlook pg. 97.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz in order to determine message priority base on subject or content as well as to display messages according to priority (Kirkland, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding claim 32, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz teaches the apparatus of Claim 30, wherein the processor is further configured to at least one

memory and stored computer program code are configured to, with the at least one processor, further cause the apparatus to provide for display prioritization to be chosen from the group consisting of displaying prioritized messages first in a list of messages, displaying prioritized messages in a new viewable window and displaying prioritized messages in a highlighted form (Kirkland, abstract. See also, [0051], fig. 6, 8.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz in order to display messages according to priority (Kirkland, abstract.).

Regarding claim 33, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz teaches the apparatus of Claim 29, wherein the processor-4s further configured to at least one memory and stored computer program code are configured to, with the at least one processor, further cause the apparatus to determine predefined attributes of the received generic-recipient message and compare the predefined attributes to pre-stored dispatch priority information to determine if the received message requires dispatch prioritization (Kirkland, abstract. See also, fig. 8.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz in order to deliver and display messages according to priority (Kirkland, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding claim 34, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz teaches the apparatus of Claim 33, wherein the processor is further configured to at least one

memory and stored computer program code are configured to, with the at least one processor, further cause the apparatus to provide for dispatch prioritization to be chosen from the group consisting of prioritizing the time at which messages will be dispatched, prioritizing the communication medium used to dispatch messages and prioritizing the recipients of the dispatched messages (Kirkland, abstract. See also, fig. 8, [0051]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz s in order to deliver and display messages according to priority (Kirkland, abstract, fig. 7, [0009]).

Regarding claim 42, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz teaches the computer program product of Claim 36, wherein the instructions configured for directing dispatch of dispatching the message to one or more recipients further comprise instructions configured for directing display of displaying the message on a display associated with the network hub (Kirkland, abstract, fig. 8.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz in order to deliver and display messages according to priority (Kirkland, abstract, fig. 7, [0009]).

Regarding claim 46, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz teaches the computer program product of Claim 45, wherein the instructions configured for directing storage of information related to message priority further comprise instructions configured for directing storage of information related to message display priority, and wherein

the instructions configured for determining whether the generic-recipient message has priority further comprise instructions configured for determining whether the generic-recipient message has display priority by comparing the predefined attributes associated with the generic-recipient message to the stored information related to message display priority (Kirkland, abstract. See also, fig. 8. See also Outlook pg. 97.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz in order to deliver and display messages according to priority (Kirkland, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Regarding claim 47, the combination of Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz teaches the computer program product of Claim 45, wherein the instructions configured for directing storage of information related to message priority further comprise instructions configured for directing storage of information related to message dispatch priority, and wherein the instructions configured for determining whether the message has priority further comprise instructions configured for determining whether the message has dispatch priority by comparing the predefined attributes associated with the messages to the stored information related to message dispatch priority (Kirkland, abstract. See also, fig. 8. See also Outlook pg. 97.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Outlook, Thomas, Kirkland, and Domnitz in order to deliver and display messages according to priority (Kirkland, abstract, fig. 7, [0009].).

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 20050182820, US 20030005060.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RYAN J. JAKOVAC whose telephone number is (571)270-5003. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 7:30 am to 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ryan Jakovac/